

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

106th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 179

June 22, 1999, 2:21 p.m.
Page S-7410 Temp. Record

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION/NED Earmark Elimination

SUBJECT: Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 . . . S.886. Feingold amendment No. 692.

ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 23-76

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 886, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001, will authorize funding for the Department of State, United States international broadcasting activities, and other foreign affairs programs for fiscal years 2000 and 2001. The funds authorized will total \$6.38 billion and \$6.03 billion for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, respectively. The bill also will authorize a 5-year, \$3 billion embassy construction program for upgrading overseas United States diplomatic facilities in response to the embassy bombings in East Africa and to the threat of other terrorist attacks.

The Feingold amendment would phase out over the next 5 years the earmarked grants (which total 65 percent of all grants) that the National Endowment of Democracy reserves for the National Democratic Institute (NDI), the International Republican Institute (IRI), the Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE), and the Solidarity Center. (The National Endowment for Democracy is a small (approximately \$30 million per year) Federal grant program under which grants are given to non-governmental entities to promote the development of democracy overseas. The four core grantees represent the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Chamber of Commerce, and the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), respectively. Each grant given, including grants to the core grantees, must be approved by a bipartisan review board.)

Those favoring the amendment contended:

Though we believe that the NED should be eliminated, we realize that we are in the minority in holding that opinion. Therefore, knowing that we will not prevail if we attempt to eliminate this agency, we have offered an amendment to try to improve it. The Feingold amendment would not cut \$1 from the authorization for the NED; all it would do is eliminate the current-law requirement

(See other side)

YEAS (23)		NAYS (76)				NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (8 or 15%)	Democrats (15 or 33%)	Republicans (46 or 85%)		Democrats (30 or 67%)		Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Fitzgerald	Baucus	Abraham	Hatch	Akaka	Kerry	McCain- ²	
Grams	Bingaman	Allard	Hutchinson	Bayh	Landrieu		
Gregg	Boxer	Ashcroft	Hutchison	Biden	Lautenberg		
Helms	Bryan	Bennett	Inhofe	Breaux	Leahy		
Nickles	Dorgan	Bond	Jeffords	Byrd	Levin		
Smith, Bob	Durbin	Brownback	Kyl	Cleland	Lieberman		
Specter	Edwards	Bunning	Lott	Conrad	Mikulski		
Thurmond	Feingold	Burns	Lugar	Daschle	Moynihan		
	Hollings	Campbell	Mack	Dodd	Murray		
	Johnson	Chafee	McConnell	Feinstein	Reed		
	Kohl	Cochran	Murkowski	Graham	Robb		
	Lincoln	Collins	Roberts	Harkin	Rockefeller		
	Reid	Coverdell	Roth	Inouye	Sarbanes		
	Wellstone	Craig	Santorum	Kennedy	Schumer		
	Wyden	Crapo	Sessions	Kerrey	Torricelli		
		DeWine	Shelby				
		Domenici	Smith, Gordon				
		Enzi	Snowe				
		Frist	Stevens				
		Gorton	Thomas				
		Gramm	Thompson				
		Grassley	Voinovich				
		Hagel	Warner				

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

that 65-percent of its grants go to four very powerful, very well-connected groups--the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Chamber of Commerce, and the AFL-CIO. Our colleagues say that these groups should get earmarked grants because they represent a broad cross-section of our political spectrum and thus can give comprehensive, expert assistance to other nations in developing democratic institutions. In response, we note that if these groups are as expert as our colleagues say, they should have no trouble in competing for grants. Other groups that desire funding from this program, and that are not as large, rich, and well-connected as the 4 core grantees, have to compete for the other 35 percent of funding. Frankly, we do not believe this approach of giving most of a program's funding to 4 powerful groups, without any competition, is a very good example of democracy in action, and it is especially objectionable when the program is supposed to be teaching democratic values in other nations. Every potential grantee should have to compete for grants on the same terms. The Feingold amendment would demand that level playing field. We urge our colleagues to support this amendment.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

This amendment has been proposed to fix something that is not broken. The National Endowment for Democracy was created in 1983 to be a way to get around bureaucratic red tape and diplomatic restrictions in order to get help, unofficially and quickly, to nascent democracy movements around the world. At very little cost, it has produced spectacular results in Europe, Central America, and elsewhere. The idea behind the program is to get Americans from across the political spectrum who are experts in the practical workings of a democracy to meet with people in other countries who have no experience in such matters and to give them advice and material assistance. Portions of the grant money are reserved for each of the political parties, for the AFL-CIO, and for the Chamber of Commerce so that they can work with their counterparts in other countries in developing political institutions. By reserving grants for each of the four groups, comity is preserved between them, and, as a result, their efforts in other countries are cooperative and complementary. In order to ensure that the earmarked funds are not misused, every proposal for spending those funds must be specifically approved by a bipartisan panel. The Feingold amendment would have us abandon this arrangement, which has worked so well for 16 years, by making these four groups compete for funds against each other and against other potential grantees. The result would be to end cooperation, which would likely harm efforts to promote democracy overseas. We oppose that result and therefore urge the rejection of this amendment.